

REMARKS

Applicant has amended claims 1-15 and provided new claim 16. Claims 1-15 have been amended to provide reference markers for the disclosed elements. Additionally, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the data server and the data transmission server are both connected to the management server. Support for this amendment can be found Figure 2.

Claim 2 has been made dependent on claim 1 and to more precisely define the management server. Support for the amendment can be found in Fig. 1-2, and specification page 13, lines 8-25.

Claim 3 has been amended to be dependent on claim 2 and further defines the data conversion and transmission server, specifically the wire terminal input elements. Support for the amendment can be found in Figs. 1-3, and specification page 12, line 1-10.

Claim 4 has been amended to be dependent on claim 2 and to further define the wireless aspects of the data conversion and transmission server. Support can be found in Figs. 1-3, and specification pages 14-15.

Claim 5 has been amended to be dependent on claim 1, and to further define the data conversion system. Support can be found in Figs. 1-2 and specification page 6, lines 25-27.

Claim 6 has been amended to be dependent on claim 2. Furthermore, claim 6 has been amended to provide a clearer and fuller description of the elements of the data server. Support can be found in Figs. 1-3, specification pages 7-9 and 14, and original claim 5.

Claim 7 has been amended to recite a method of data conversion and transmission. Support can be found in Figs. 1-3 and original claim 6.

Claim 8 has been made dependent on claim 7 and recites the subject matter of original claim 7. Claim 9 is now dependent on claim 7 and recites the subject matter of original claim 8. Claim 10 is now dependent on claim 7 and recites the subject matter of original claim 9. Claim 11 is now dependent on claim 7 and recites the subject matter of original claim 10. Claim 12 is now dependent on claim 7 and recites

the subject matter of original claim 11. Claim 13 is now dependent on claim 7 and recites the subject matter of original claim 12. Claim 14 is now dependent on claim 7 and recites the subject matter of original claim 13. Claim 15 is now dependent on claim 7 and recites the subject matter of original claim 14. New claim 16 is dependent on claim 7 and recites the subject matter of original claim 15.

As such, none of the amended or new claims present any new matter.

The Examiner has rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the term “the data server.” Applicant points out that amended claim 1 now recites “a data server”. As such, the Examiner’s rejection is now believed to be moot.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hafsteinsson (U.S. 2004/ 0172484) in view of Hofmann (U.S. 2001/0009016).

Independent claims 1 and 7, as amended, set forth non-obvious subject matter because they recite that the exchange of the information between the wireless and wired terminal clients, whether initiated by the information provider or the information requester, is accomplished by the use of input forms that reflect the specific needs of the requester. This allows in input requester to prepare meaningful search parameters for a specific product or service. Additionally, claims 1 and 7 recite the claimed system’s ability to extract the information from the appropriate input form and convert the extracted information into a suitable format for transfer to a specific terminal using a specified protocol.

In contrast, Hafsteinsson merely provides a method of communicating between a transmitting device and a receiving device with the addition of an intermediate conversion step. There is no mention of using input forms stored on a data server to assist in preparing a meaningful search. As such, Hafsteinsson fails to disclose a system that is capable of extracting input form data and transmitting it to a specific terminal platform.

The Examiner cites Hofmann merely because it teaches the use of wired clients and servers. Hofmann does not cite the use of saved server-based input forms.

Additionally, Hofmann is directed to presenting data on a user device and not a system of distributing and retrieving data.

Clearly there can be no proper combination of the Hafsteinsson and Hofmann references which points out each and every element of amended claims 1 or 7. Both prior art references fail to point out the use of specified input forms. It would be impossible for any combination of the prior art to point out extracting and converting the data from those forms and transmitting them in proper protocol to the proper wired or wireless terminal. As such, the amended claims are not obvious in view of the cited prior art. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests removal of the Examiner's rejection of the pending claims.

Claims 2-6 and 8-16 are dependent directly or indirectly on independent claims 1 or 7. Since claims 1 and 7 are shown not to be obvious over the cited references, those claims that depend from them are equally patentable thereover.

Based on the foregoing, early and favorable action is respectfully requested and earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Jordan G. Garner
Registration No. 60,148

MAILING ADDRESS

Hedman & Costigan, P.C.
1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, N.Y. 10036-2646
(212) 302-8989